Case 2:22-cv-03728-24-20-04-12-20-09/19/22 Page 1 of 13

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

purpose of initiating the civil do	JCKET SHEET. (SEE INSTRUC	TIONS ON NEXT FAGE OF	*			
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANT			
Michael J. Good	lson, Sr., 7606 Louis	e Lane	City of Philadelphia, 1515 Arch Street, 16th Floor, Phila, PA			
Wvndmoor. PA			Christopher Flacco. 1515 Arch Street. 16th Floor. Phila PA			
(b) County of Residence of	of First Listed Plaintiff <u>M</u> XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CAS	lontgomery, PA	County of Residenc	e of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES C	DM/ V)	
(L2	ICELLI IIV O.S. LEAIVIII LE	<i>3L3)</i>	NOTE: IN LAND O	CONDEMNATION CASES, USE TO TOF LAND INVOLVED.	*	
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, 2	Address, and Telephone Number	r)	Attorneys (If Known)		
Duane L. Lassite	er, Esquire, Lassiter	& Associates, P.C	D.			
	eet, Suite 1200, Phil					
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in (One Box Only)			(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)	
1 U.S. Government × 3 Federal Question		(For Diversity Cases Only	PTF DEF	PTF DEF		
Plaintiff	Plaintiff (U.S. Government Not a Party)		Citizen of This State	1 Incorporated or Pr of Business In T		
2 U.S. Government Defendant			Citizen of Another State	2 Incorporated and I of Business In A		
			Citizen or Subject of a [Foreign Country	3 G Soreign Nation	6 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT			Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.			
CONTRACT 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	RTS PERSONAL INJURY	625 Drug Related Seizure	BANKRUPTCY 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	375 False Claims Act	
120 Marine	310 Airplane	365 Personal Injury -	of Property 21 USC 881	423 Withdrawal	376 Qui Tam (31 USC	
130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument	315 Airplane Product Liability	Product Liability 367 Health Care/	690 Other	28 USC 157	3729(a)) 400 State Reapportionment	
150 Recovery of Overpayment	320 Assault, Libel &	Pharmaceutical		PROPERTY RIGHTS	410 Antitrust	
& Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act	Slander 330 Federal Employers'	Personal Injury Product Liability		820 Copyrights 830 Patent	430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce	
152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans	Liability 340 Marine	368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product		835 Patent - Abbreviated New Drug Application	460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and	
(Excludes Veterans)	345 Marine Product	Liability		840 Trademark	Corrupt Organizations	
153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	Liability 350 Motor Vehicle	PERSONAL PROPERT 370 Other Fraud	Y LABOR 710 Fair Labor Standards	880 Defend Trade Secrets Act of 2016	480 Consumer Credit (15 USC 1681 or 1692)	
160 Stockholders' Suits	355 Motor Vehicle	371 Truth in Lending	Act		485 Telephone Consumer	
190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability	Product Liability 360 Other Personal	380 Other Personal Property Damage	720 Labor/Management Relations	861 HIA (1395ff)	Protection Act 490 Cable/Sat TV	
196 Franchise	Injury	385 Property Damage	740 Railway Labor Act	862 Black Lung (923)	850 Securities/Commodities/	
	362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice	Product Liability	751 Family and Medical Leave Act	863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 864 SSID Title XVI	Exchange 890 Other Statutory Actions	
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITIONS		865 RSI (405(g))	891 Agricultural Acts	
210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure	440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting	Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee	791 Employee Retirement Income Security Act	FEDERAL TAX SUITS	893 Environmental Matters 895 Freedom of Information	
230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	× 442 Employment	510 Motions to Vacate		870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff	Act	
240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability	443 Housing/ Accommodations	Sentence 530 General		or Defendant) 871 IRS—Third Party	896 Arbitration 899 Administrative Procedure	
290 All Other Real Property	445 Amer. w/Disabilities -	535 Death Penalty	IMMIGRATION	26 USC 7609	Act/Review or Appeal of	
	Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities -	Other: 540 Mandamus & Other	462 Naturalization Application 465 Other Immigration	on	Agency Decision 950 Constitutionality of	
	Other 448 Education	550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition	Actions		State Statutes	
		560 Civil Detainee -				
		Conditions of Confinement				
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" is	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					
1"1 ~ 1 1		Remanded from Appellate Court		ferred from 6 Multidistr ner District Litigation f(y) Transfer		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	42 II S C 200a at sag	tute under which you are	filing (Do not cite jurisdictional st	tatutes unless diversity):		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	Brief description of car This claim involves raci					
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.		DEMAND \$ in excess of \$150,000	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint: Yes No		
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER		
DATE		SIGNATURE OF ATTO	OKNEY OF RECORD			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		July				
	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP	JUDGE	MAG. JUI	DGE	

Case 2:22-cv-03728-NIOA Document 1 Filed 09/19/22 Page 2 of 13 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

DESIGNATION FORM

(to be used by counsel or pro se plaintiff to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to the appropriate calendar)

Address of Plaintiff:	7606 Louise Lane, Wyndmoor, PA 19038						
Address of Defendant: 1515 Arch Street, 16th Floor, Philadelphia, PA 19102							
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction:							
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:							
Case Number:							
Civil cases are deemed related when <i>Yes</i> is answered 1. Is this case related to property included in an ear							
previously terminated action in this court?							
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit Yes No Polytherape transaction as a prior suit Yes							
 Does this case involve the validity or infringement numbered case pending or within one year previous. 	nt of a patent already in suit or any earlier Yes No No						
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus case filed by the same individual?	, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights Yes No						
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case in this court except as noted above.	is not r lated to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in						
DATE: 9/19/2022	81323						
3	Attorney-at-Law / Pro Se Plaintiff Attorney I.D. # (if applicable)						
CIVIL: (Place a √in one category only)							
CIVIL: (Place a $$ in one category only) A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:						
The state of the s							
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and A. 2. FELA 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability - Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases (Please specify):						
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and A. 2. FELA 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): (The effect of the contract	Il Other Contracts 1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability — Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases (Please specify): ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (this certification is to remove the case from eligibility for arbitration.) msel of record or pro se plaintiff, do hereby certify:						
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and A. 2. FELA 2. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): (The effect of the contract of the c	Il Other Contracts 1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability — Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases (Please specify): ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION This certification is to remove the case from eligibility for arbitration.) msel of record or pro se plaintiff, do hereby certify: that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case interest and costs:						
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and A. 2. FELA 2. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): (The effect of the contract of the c	Il Other Contracts 1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability — Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases (Please specify): ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION This certification is to remove the case from eligibility for arbitration.) msel of record or pro se plaintiff, do hereby certify: that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case interest and costs:						
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and A. 2. FELA 2. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): (The effect of the contract of the c	Il Other Contracts 1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability — Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases (Please specify): ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION This certification is to remove the case from eligibility for arbitration.) msel of record or pro se plaintiff, do hereby certify: that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case interest and costs:						

Case 2:22-cv-03728-NIQA Document 1 Filed 09/19/22 Page 3 of 13

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

Michael J. Goodson, Sr.

Telephone	FAX Number	E-Mail Address			
Date (215) 923	Attorney-at-law (215) 923-1611	Attorney for dlassiter@dlllaw.co	m		
9/19/2022	JUN	Michael J. Goodson,	Sr.		
(f) Standard Management -	Cases that do not fall into ar	ny one of the other tracks.	\checkmark		
(e) Special Management – C commonly referred to as the court. (See reverse simanagement cases.)	Cases that do not fall into trace complex and that need specide of this form for a detailed	ial or intense management by	()		
(d) Asbestos – Cases involvi exposure to asbestos.	ing claims for personal injur	y or property damage from	()		
(c) Arbitration - Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2					
(b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits.					
(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.					
SELECT ONE OF THE FO	OLLOWING CASE MANA	AGEMENT TRACKS:			
In accordance with the Civiplaintiff shall complete a Cafiling the complaint and service of this form.) In the designation, that defendant is	use Management Track Designer a copy on all defendants. (Sevent that a defendant does shall, with its first appearance tries, a Case Management Track	y Reduction Plan of this court, counsing gration Form in all civil cases at the times at 1:03 of the plan set forth on the result of agree with the plaintiff regarding the, submit to the clerk of court and ser rack Designation Form specifying the gned.	me of everse g said eve on		
City of Philadelphia ar Flacco	id Christopher	NO.			
٧.	:				
Michael J. Goodson, S	и.	CIVIL ACTION			

(Civ. 660) 10/02

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

MICHAEL J. GOODSON, SR. : 7606 Louise Lane : Wyndmoor, PA 19038, :

Plaintiff

:

V.

:

CITY OF PHILADELPHIA
1515 Arch Street, 16th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19102

and : CHIEF INSPECTOR CHRISTOPHER :

FLACCO : c/o City of Philadelphia : 1515 Arch Street, 16th Floor : Philadelphia, PA 19102, :

Defendants:

CIVIL ACTION

I. JURISDICTION

Plaintiff Michael J. Goodson brings this action under Title VII of the Civil
Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e et seq. (hereinafter, "Title VII"), 42
U.S.C. § 1983 and 42 U.S.C. § 1988. Jurisdiction is invoked pursuant to 28
U.S.C. § 1391(b) inasmuch as Plaintiff's causes of action arose in the Eastern
District of Pennsylvania and all Defendants are found in the Eastern District of
Pennsylvania. Thus, venue is proper in this court.

II. THE PARTIES

- Plaintiff Michael J. Goodson, Sr. (hereinafter "Plaintiff) is an adult, African-American male who at all times relevant hereto resided at 7606 Louise Lane, Wyndmoor, Pennsylvania.
- 3. Defendant City of Philadelphia (hereinafter "City") is a municipality located in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, defined as City of the first class" under the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, having principal offices in its Law Department located at 1515 Arch Street, Philadelphia, PA 19102. Defendant City owns, operates, manages and directs the Philadelphia Police Department. This Defendant City employs in excess of 500 employees.
- 4. At all times relevant hereto, Defendant Christopher Flacco (hereinafter "Flacco") is an adult male employee of Defendant City and its Police Department as well as an employee, servant, workman and/or agent of Defendant City. This Defendant was assigned and served, at all times relevant hereto, in a supervisory capacity as Chief Inspector of the Police Department and, as such, is a policymaker for Defendant City. Defendant Flacco is being sued individually and in his official capacity as Chief Inspector of said Police Department.
- 5. At all times relevant hereto, Defendant City, through its Police Department, acted or failed to act through its authorized agents who were acting within the course and scope of their employment with Defendant City. Specifically, the Defendant City, as a matter of custom, policy and/or practice, intentionally and deliberately failed to adequately train or otherwise direct Defendant Flacco concerning race discrimination and retaliation, thereby causing Defendant Flacco to engage in the illegal and unlawful conduct which created a racially hostile and

retaliatory work environment for Plaintiff and which caused Plaintiff to sustain injuries requiring continuing treatment as described herein below.

III. ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE

- 6. On or about June 9, 2022, Plaintiff filed EEOC Charge No. 530-2021-05282.
- 7. On June 22, 2022, the Philadelphia District Office issued the Notice of Right to Sue. A copy of the Notice of Right to Sue is attached herewith and made a part hereof as Exhibit A.
- 8. All other conditions precedent to the institution of this action have been fulfilled

IV. STATEMENT OF CLAIMS

- 9. Plaintiff began his employment with the Philadelphia Police Department as a police officer on or about February 2, 2001.
- 10. Since the beginning of his career with Defendant City, Plaintiff has been promoted through the ranks from patrolman to captain due to the quality of his job performance and his successful performance on the promotional examinations.
- 11. While his job performance and successful results from the promotional examination experience have been positive, he has been subjected to a racially harassing, hostile work environment exclusively promoted and created by Chief Inspector Christopher Flacco. These unlawful practices include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - (a) In November of 2020, Plaintiff tested positive for COVID-19. While out of work due to the severity of the conditions which rendered him physically unable to work, he was forced to reschedule a promotional examination. The

examination was rescheduled after a second COVID-19 test resulted in a negative finding. Inspector Flacco publicly berated him in the presence of other police officers. These openly public comments about his health were made about him as a suggestion that he was a lazy black employee. While he tested negative for COVID when he took the promotional examination, the symptoms continued, even after the negative result. Flacco publicly stated "It's good to see some folk aren't playing COVID anymore." This comment was made on or about February 25, 2021.

- (b) On or about March 25, 2021, Chief Inspector Flacco shouted obscenities at Plaintiff during his presentation of work-related investigation projects. No Caucasian lieutenants were subjected to such behavior publicly.
- (c) On or about April 22, 2021, during a meeting regarding investigation plans on progress, Chief Inspector Flacco scolded and repeatedly spoke to Plaintiff by saying, "You are a bull shxxer!" Flacco was smiling as he made these comments to Plaintiff.
- (d) Chief Inspector Flacco intentionally assigned investigation support staff who were inexperienced or who had health challenges which affected job performance.
- (e) On or about September 8, 2021, while providing updates regarding ongoing investigations during a staff meeting, Flacco screamed at Plaintiff during his presentation and repeatedly used the word "shxt" numerous times. When the two Caucasian sergeants made their presentations, Flacco immediately

- changed his language by speaking to these officers without the profanities or name calling.
- 12. Chief Inspector Flacco's repeated use of the profanities when commenting about Plaintiff, his work and his health was and is open, notorious and offensive because of Plaintiff's race, upon information and belief. Chief Inspector Flacco did not use any offensive terms to address or refer to Caucasian police officers.
- 13. As Chief Inspector, Mr. Flacco had the authority to take employment actions against Plaintiff, including, but not limited to, assigning investigation projects and rating performance evaluations.
- 14. Plaintiff complained to Captain Merrick before Plaintiff took the promotional examination.
- 15. No corrective action was taken by the Police Department though it was well known that Chief Inspector Flacco routinely targeted only Plaintiff for the demeaning, racially offensive comments in the presence of other police officers.
- 16. Upon information and belief, Chief Inspector Flacco contacted the Safety Office of the Philadelphia Police Department in an effort to pursue disciplinary action against Plaintiff because Plaintiff took the COVID-19 test.
- 17. While recovering from COVID-19, Plaintiff also experienced cardiac issues which prompted him to consult his primary care physician who is now a cardiologist.
- 18. Plaintiff was diagnosed with having a condition referred to as "COVID Heart" consistent with the symptoms of weakness, palpitations and exhaustion experienced.

- 19. As a result, the cardiologist and the primary care physician directed Plaintiff not to return to work.
- 20. While he was out of work in recovery, Plaintiff was informed that Flacco continued to comment negatively about Plaintiff's health relentlessly in meetings with other employees.
- 21. While Plaintiff complained to the highest level of leadership for the Philadelphia Police Department, no corrective action has been taken regarding the conduct of Flacco.
- 22. At all times throughout his employment, Plaintiff performed his positions well as he has risen through the ranks in the Philadelphia Police Department.
- 23. The conduct of Chief Inspector Flacco constitutes a racially discriminating employment practice in that Caucasian police officers under his command are treated more favorably by Flacco than Plaintiff because of Plaintiff's race.
- 24. The unlawful employment practices of Chief Inspector Flacco as stated herein were and are intentional.
- 25. The unlawful employment practices complained of herein were and are done with malice and reckless indifference to federally protected rights secured to Plaintiff under Title VII.
- 26. Because Defendant City has taken no steps to train, supervise or discipline Chief Inspector Flacco, his racially offensive conduct toward Plaintiff continues.
- 27. As a direct and proximate result of the relentless racially offensive conduct of Chief Inspector Flacco to which Plaintiff has been subjected, and as a result of Defendant City's failure, as a pattern or practice of such failure, to train,

supervise, instruct or discipline Defendant Flacco regarding racial discrimination in the workplace, Plaintiff has continued to experience race-based harassment at the hands of Chief Inspector Flacco, mental anguish, anxiety, humiliation and embarrassment, all of which has had a detrimental effect on Plaintiff's wellbeing and relationship with family members.

FEDERAL CLAIMS

COUNT 1: Plaintiff v. City of Philadelphia (Violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983; 14th Amendment)

- 28. The allegations contained in all preceding paragraphs are incorporated here as if set forth fully and here reiterated in their entirety.
- 29. The acts and failures to act of Defendant Flacco, and other supervisory personnel, individually and/or jointly, all of whom acted under color of law, caused the Plaintiff to be subjected to the deprivation of his rights to equal protection of the law as guaranteed him under the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution.
- 30. The acts and failures to act of Defendant Flacco, and other supervisory personnel, were direct acts and failures to act of Defendant City
- 31. The acts and failures to act of Defendant Flacco, and other supervisory personnel, violated the Plaintiff's right to Equal Protection of the Law guaranteed him under the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution, redressable under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff prays for judgment against the Defendant named in this count, individually and/or jointly, for damages in excess of One Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$150,000.00), and for reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988(b).

COUNT II: Plaintiff v. Defendants, Individually (Violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983; 14th Amendment Due Process)

- 32. The allegations contained in all preceding paragraphs are incorporated here as if set forth fully and here reiterated in their entirety.
- 33. The direct and retaliatory acts and failures to act of Defendants, who acted under color of law, caused the Plaintiff to be subjected to the deprivation of his rights to equal protection of the law as guaranteed him under the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution.
- 34. The acts and failures to act of Defendant Flacco were his intentional individual acts and violated the Plaintiff's right to Equal Protection of the Law guaranteed him under the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution, redressable under 42 U.S.C. § 1988.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff prays for judgment against the Defendants named in this count for damages in excess of One Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$150,000.00), and for reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983(b).

COUNT III: Plaintiff v. Defendant City (Violation of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2(a)(1)

- 35. The allegations in all preceding paragraphs are incorporated and made part of this paragraph as if fully set forth here.
- 36. The acts and/or failures to act of Defendant Flacco, which were the acts and failures to act of Defendant City, discriminated against the Plaintiff in the terms and conditions of his employment and denied him of rights and/or protections secured to him by the Equal Protection clause of the 14th Amendment.

37. The acts and failures to act of Defendant Flacco, which were the acts and failures to act of Defendant City, discriminated against the Plaintiff on the basis of race and constituted an unlawful employment practice in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-1.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff prays for judgment against the Defendant named in this count, individually and/or jointly, for damages in excess of One Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$150,000.00), and for reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988(b).

COUNT IV: Plaintiff v. Defendant City (Violation of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2(a)(2)

- 38. The allegations contained in all preceding paragraphs are incorporated here as if set forth fully and here reiterated in their entirety.
- 39. The acts and/or failures to act of Defendant Flacco, which were the acts and failures to act of Defendant City, discriminated against the Plaintiff by serving to limit, segregate and classify him in a way which deprived him of employment opportunities and adversely affected his status as an employee because of his race.
- 40. The acts and failures to act of Defendant Flacco, which were the acts and failures to act of Defendant City, discriminated against the Plaintiff on the basis of his race and constituted an unlawful employment practice in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 2000e(a)(2).

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff prays for judgment against the Defendant named in this Count IV for damages in excess of One Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$150,000.00), and for reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988(b).

STATE LAW CLAIMS

COUNT V: Plaintiff v. Defendants City of Philadelphia and Christopher Flacco (Violation of 42 Pa. C.S. § 955(a))

- 41. The allegations contained in all preceding paragraphs are incorporated here as if set forth fully and here reiterated in their entirety.
- 42. The acts and failures to act of Defendant Flacco, which were the acts and failures to act of Defendant City, tended to discriminate against the Plaintiff with respect to compensation, hire, tenure, terms, conditions or privileges on his employment on the basis of his race.
- 43. The acts and failures to act of Defendant Flacco, which were the acts and failures to act of Defendant City, constituted an unfair employment practice proscribed by 42 Pa. C.S. § 955(a).

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff prays for judgment against the Defendant named in this Count V, individually and/or jointly, for damages in excess of One Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$150,000.00), and for reasonable attorneys' fees and costs as may be allowed by law.

DUANE L. LASSITER, ESQUIRE LASSITER & ASSOCIATES, P.C. 1515 Market Street, Suite 1200 Philadelphia, PA 19102